

REMARKS

Claims 1, 30, 42 and 45 have been amended to remove the claim to amino propyl triethoxy silane and its reaction products. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application to the cancelled subject matter. In addition claim 1 has been amended to correct an obvious error and change "overcoating" to "overlayer". This layer which has no patentable significance, has been made to conform claim 1 to dependent claims which use "overlayer". Claims 20 and 22, which claimed amino propyl triethoxy silane and amine terminated polyamide, specifically, have been cancelled.

Claims 1 as presently constituted stands rejected as being anticipated, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), by Lever, et al., EP 0 458 481.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection and submit that the claim is not *prima facie* anticipated (or obvious for that matter).

Lever discloses a multilayer film suitable for use as a drafting film. The film comprises:

1. a substrate layer of polymeric material;
2. a lacquer layer of polymeric material different from that of the substrate; and
3. a toner-receptive layer containing a copolymer comprising styrene and/or a styrene derivative, and at least one ethylenically unsaturated comonomer copolymerizable therewith, the copolymer containing at least one full functional acid group.

While there are some similarities between the Applicants' invention and the drafting film disclosed by Lever, there are also significant differences, especially with regard to Lever's lacquer layer and Applicants' underlayer coating. More specifically, the Examiner has characterized Lever as teaching a lacquer layer comprising (broadly) "a polymer material which has crosslinkable functional groups, such as amine and triethoxy silyl groups...." However, that characterization is misleading. More correctly, Lever teaches at the top of page three that the lacquer layer comprises suitable resins, including copolymers of acrylic and methacrylic acid and esters thereof that may contain crosslinkable functional groups such as amine or triethoxy silyl groups.

The publication to Lever lists about 10 different "backbones" as useful in his underlayer. However, polyamides, which is the backbone of the claimed coating polymer is not one of them.

Clearly Applicants' invention is not disclosed by Lever and there is no *prima facie* basis for rejecting any of the claims herein under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or §103(a).

Also, Applicants submit that a close reading of Lever leads to the inescapable conclusion that what Lever teaches is so far from Applicants' invention that Applicants' invention would not be obvious to one skilled in the art in view of Lever.

More specifically, the differences between the components taught by Lever for the lacquer layer and the components for Applicants' underlayer coating are so great that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to try the components claimed herein in place of those taught by Lever. Thus, Applicants submit that there is no *prima facie* case for obviousness either.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims herein are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Fenster
Reg. No. 33,877

December 21, 2003
William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650

Tel: 212-521-5400